DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 334 UD 026 324

AUTHOR Orfield, Gary; Monfort, Franklin
TITLE Racial Change & Desegregation in Large School Districts: Trends through the 1986-1987 School Year.
INSTITUTION National School Boards Association, Washington, DC. Council of Urban Boards of Education.
PUB DATE Jul 88
NOTE 41p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Asian Americans; Black Students; Civil Rights Legislation; Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; *Enrollment Trends; Hispanic Americans; *Minority Groups; Neighborhood Schools; Racial Balance; Racial Composition; Racial Distribution; *Racial Integration; *School Demography; *School Desegregation; School Policy; Suburban Schools; *Urban Schools; Urban to Suburban Migration; White Students

ABSTRACT

Dramatic changes in the size and racial composition of the nation's largest urban school districts are indicators of an increasingly multiracial and highly segregated society. Data were analyzed from the 1986-87 and 1984-85 Department of Education computer tapes containing the enrollments by race of 36,000 schools from 3,400 districts nationwide. All districts that had more than 19,000 students and at least 50 students of any minority group enrolled were examined. Major declines in overall White enrollments have occurred, reflecting changes in the national birthrate. A number of the largest districts have experienced particularly acute White declines. Contrary to earlier expectations, White districts losing White enrollment have seldom become virtually all Black. Most are becoming more multiracial, showing heavy increases in Hispanic and Asian enrollments. These changes do not appear to be linked to any particular type of school desegregation plan or neighborhood schools approach. Trends in racial segregation patterns from 1967 to the present show that Black and Hispanic students in big city school districts are usually highly segregated from White students. For Blacks, the data show pattern changes that appear to be related to desegregation orders, the initial racial composition of the district, and demographic changes. Hispanics in central cities with significant Hispanic enrollments have become more segregated with virtually no exceptions. Extensive statistical data are included on 22 tables. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

9-13-88

ED299334

RACIAL

Change & Desegregation in Large School Districts

Trends Through the 1986-1987 School Year

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gary Orfield
U. Chicago

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Publication of the NSBA Council of Urban Boards of Education

NSBA
LEADERSHIP FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

UD026324

STEERING COMMITTEE
NSBA COUNCIL OF URBAN BOARDS OF EDUCATION

Jonathan Wilson, Chairman
Des Moines, Iowa

Gwendolyn C. Baker, Vice Chairman
Brooklyn, New York

Carlos Avelar, II
Phoenix, Arizona

Betty Drost
Tacoma, Washington

Jean Fink
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Frank W. Gardner
Chicago, Illinois

Stephen Kafoury
Portland, Oregon

Sandra Kostos
Omaha, Nebraska

Marjorie R. Smith
Saint Louis, Missouri

Henry Spears
Montgomery, Alabama

Ulysses Spiva
Virginia Beach, Virginia

Eva Bacal, Immediate Past Chairman
Tucson, Arizona

James R. Oglesby, NSBA President-Elect
and Board of Directors' Liaison

Octavius T. Reid, Jr., Executive Director
New Jersey School Boards Association
and Executive Directors' Liaison Committee Liaison

Leonard Rovins, NSBA President
NSBA Board of Directors

Thomas A. Shannon, NSBA Executive Director

Don E. Blom, Associate Executive Director, Office of Special Programs, Coordination and Planning

Sandra O. Heningburg, Director, Department of Special Program Services

Jacqueline Henderson, Manager, Special Program Support Services

RACIAL CHANGE AND DESEGREGATION IN LARGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

TRENDS THROUGH THE 1986-1987 SCHOOL YEAR

A Report of the Council of Urban Boards of Education

and the

National School Desegregation Project of the

University of Chicago

Gary Orfield

Franklin Monfort

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

On behalf of the members of the Steering Committee of the NSBA Council of Urban Boards of Education, I wish to thank Eve Shepard and Carol Skinner for their diligent efforts in the production of this report.

The basic analysis of the federal data tapes was carried out by Franklin Monfort at the University of Wisconsin's Center for Demography, with the assistance of Alma Taeuber. Further analysis and the interpretation of the data were carried out by Gary Orfield at the University of Chicago. Professor Orfield gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Carla Hess, William Ponicki, Stelios Valavanis, and Carol Horton in the preparation of the data.

Without their assistance and input, we could not have carried out this project to a successful completion.

Jonathan C. Wilson
Chairman
NSBA Council of Urban Boards
of Education
July 1988

THE SCOPE OF THE ISSUE

Dramatic changes in the size and racial composition of the nation's largest school districts are indicators of sweeping changes coming in the increasingly multi-racial and highly segregated society in which American children are growing up. Major declines in the overall white enrollments of American public education have occurred during the past generation, reflecting major changes in the national birthrates. A number of the largest districts have experienced particularly acute white declines and face ever more serious obstacles to significant school integration. Contrary to earlier expectations, however, white districts losing white enrollment have seldom become virtually all-black. Most are becoming much more multi-racial. These changes do not appear to be linked to any particular type of school desegregation plan or neighborhood schools approach; they reflect more basic forces and affect districts with diametrically opposed approaches to desegregation.

The second portion of this report measures changes in segregation stretching back to 1967 for black students and 1968 for Hispanic students in large urban districts, showing the changes in racial isolation that have occurred since the federal government began collecting racial statistics from school districts. The data show that black and Hispanic students in big city districts are usually highly segregated from whites. For blacks the pattern over the period is a mixed one of positive and negative changes that appear to be related to desegregation orders, the initial racial composition of the district, and demographic changes. Blacks enrolled in school systems with metropolitan desegregation orders have remained very much more integrated since the orders were imposed in the early 1970's. Hispanics in central cities with significant Hispanic enrollments have become much more segregated since the 1960's with virtually no exceptions. Hispanics living in suburbs, on the other hand, often experience more integration.

Overall, the data show that court orders of the 1960's and early 1970's had major positive impacts on black desegregation. Since the mid-1970's, however, there has been an overall stalemate for black desegregation, with gains offset by increases in racial isolation elsewhere. Hispanics, on the other hand, have been continually moving toward increasing isolation throughout the entire period and in all parts of the country.

This report is designed to describe trends in enrollment and segregation, not to assess their consequences or to propose solutions. That work is going on at the University of Chicago in the Metropolitan Opportunity Project. It is important to note, however, that these trends deserve the most urgent attention because there is strong and consistent evidence that racial segregation remains very strongly associated with economic segregation. Black and Hispanic schools not only serve very disproportionate numbers of poor children, but continue to do much worse than white schools in academic achievement, graduation rates and other

key measures of academic opportunity in metropolitan America. (Walsh, 1986; Witte, 1987; Espinosa and Ochoa, 1986; Jaeger, 1987; Garrett, 1987; Designs for Change, 1986.)

Separate education has not become equal in the United States of the 1980's. There is no indication that the severe inequalities that led minority families and organizations to institute the early desegregation cases have yet been resolved.

Types of Districts Examined. This report looks at all large school districts in the United States and compares changes in the large cities and the largest suburban and metropolitan area districts that exist in some portions of the country. A good deal of careful attention is given to the experiences of the largest central city districts for several reasons. First, they have long played a particularly important role in black and Hispanic education. Second, these school districts, which long provided the models for American public education and trained much of the nation's leadership are now subject to continual attack related to racial change. During the past generation most of the large urban districts have rapidly lost enrollment and many have an overwhelming "minority" school enrollment, which normally contains very large numbers of students from low income families with educational and other problems. There has been a vast redistribution of middle class students to suburban school districts.

The first part of this report examines data from 1967 to 1986 to show the nature of the changes in enrollment: which large districts have lost and gained the largest number of students, how the population of many districts became much more multi-racial, and where the most rapidly growing groups of students -- Hispanics and Asians -- are concentrating.

The second part of the report analyzes changes in the levels of racial segregation for blacks, Hispanics and Asians in large districts during this period. It also provides new information on the changing racial composition of the schools attended by typical white students who remain in central city school systems. The data show a nation in transition, a nation in which our school enrollment statistics are telling us about a new, profoundly multi-racial society that neither our political leaders, research community, nor media have yet fully recognized. Teachers and school officials are dealing with a society that has changed dramatically since the time of our grandparents and that is continuing to change very rapidly.

Data for This Study. This study is based on new analyses of the 1986-87 and 1984-85 Department of Education computer tapes, which contain the enrollments by race of 36,260 schools from 3,378 districts across the United States. This report examines all surveyed districts which had more than 19,000 students and at least 50 students of any minority group enrolled in 1986. While the Department of Education does not survey every district every year, it does collect complete and frequent data

from the great majority of the largest systems. This report includes only those districts which are included in the Department of Education's 1986 data tapes. (Racial enrollment data by school for districts not collected by the federal government may be available from local or state school officials even in those years not sampled by the Department of Education. Such data was not used here, however.) This report also draws on a number of earlier studies of 1984-85 and earlier data analyzed by the National School Desegregation Research Project at the University of Chicago sponsored by the Spencer Foundation.

The possibility of comparing district-level segregation data from the present with the levels stretching back to the first federal collection of national school enrollment data in 1967 relies entirely on the invaluable work done in 1981 by Professor Reynolds Farley at the University of Michigan for the National Institute of Education. Farley's 1981 report presented two key segregation measures for many large city districts, as well as their enrollment information, in a convenient form for the years 1967-1978. (The Hispanic data begin in 1968). These data enable us to make comparisons over a period of almost two decades, decades that include vast demographic shifts as well as sweeping changes in law and policy that affect many U.S. school districts.

Change in the Composition of the Largest School Districts. School districts and the cities they represent cover a wide range of sizes and demographic trends. There are eight mega-districts with 150,000 or more students and one, New York, that enrolls nearly one million. Below that there are about an equal number between the 100,000 and the 150,000 mark, and nearly three dozen with 50,000 to 100,000 students from whom the federal government collected racial data in 1986-87.

These districts, although only a tiny fraction of the many thousands of school districts in the United States, are extremely important because they enroll a significant share of the nation's total pupil population and a much larger share of the black and Hispanic enrollments. The twenty-five largest central city districts, for example, enrolled 1.8 million, or 27.5 percent of the nation's 1986 black enrollment and 1.2 million, or 30.0 percent of the U.S. Hispanic enrollment. These large city districts, however, served a very much smaller share of the country's white students, only 3.3 percent in 1986-87.

This problem of a rapidly growing minority sector of our student population being disproportionately concentrated in big city school districts is raising severe social and educational difficulties. These urban systems with rapidly declining white and middle class enrollments and growing numbers of children from families living in isolated, very low income inner city minority communities are at the center of contemporary school segregation problems, as the statistics in the second portion of this paper make clear. Many of the political and financial challenges that central city school systems face arise directly from the change in the racial and economic background of their student bodies.

One of the striking facts about the list of the largest districts printed in Table 1 is that they are not all big city districts, as almost all of them would have been a generation or two ago, and a growing number are in the Sunbelt, not the old industrial urban centers. Within the ten largest districts there is one suburban system, Fairfax County (VA), and among the top twenty-five districts, there are a number of other suburban systems and metropolitan county systems. Among the largest systems listed in Table 1 are more than two dozen non-central city districts, all of which are bigger than many of the traditionally visible urban districts that have fallen from the list of biggest school districts. Even within the very large systems, in other words, central cities have a declining presence. It is therefore possible to make interesting comparisons between fundamentally different types of school districts ranging from affluent suburbs to overwhelmingly minority, low income central city districts.

Table 1

CHANGES IN TOTAL ENROLLMENT
LARGEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1967-1986

District	Year						
	1967	1968	1974	1976	1986	Change	%Change
New York	1101804	1063787	1095388	1076325	946659	-155145	-14
Los Angeles	652608	653549	602755	601703	587362	-65246	-10
Chicago	574801	582274	530191	520742	427570	-147231	-26
Dade Co., FL (Miami)	220011	232465	246342	240023	243690	23679	11
Houston ISD	256459	246098	211369	209843	194573	-61886	-24
Philadelphia	279907	282617	266500	260857	187139	-92768	-33
Detroit	293000	296097	256300	238209	159669	-133331	-46
Dallas ISD	157110	159924	149510	138926	132780	-24330	-15
Fairfax Co., VA	107990	107990	NA	NA	131945	23955	22
Broward Co., FL	93777	103003	137639	136576	131726	37949	40
Baltimore	191997	192171	173192	159781	118081	-73916	-38
Hillsborough Co., FL	94641	100985	114855	114911	115373	20732	22
Memphis	123465	125813	115857	121155	113151	-10314	-8
San Diego	118934	128914	121278	119998	108254	-10680	-9
Prince Geo. Co., MD	136463	NA	NA	NA	102987	-33476	-25

Table 1 continued

CHANGES IN TOTAL ENROLLMENT
LARGEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1967-1986

District	Year						
	1967	1968	1974	1976	1986	Change	%Change
Duval Co., FL	122109	122637	112152	109536	102966	-19143	-16
Montgomery Co., MD	116019	NA	NA	NA	99161	-16858	-15
Clark Co., NV	62967	NA	NA	NA	95023	32056	51
Jefferson Co., KY	137392	NA	NA	NA	93128	-44264	-32
Milwaukee	128170	130445	118474	108798	90234	-37936	-30
Pinellas Co., FL	74706	NA	NA	NA	88934	14228	19
Palm Beach Co., FL	59080	61715	70766	70900	84680	25600	43
Washington, DC	148911	148725	130926	125058	84630	-64281	-43
New Orleans	108861	110783	93927	92202	84415	-24446	-22
Orange Co., FL	72800	NA	NA	NA	84125	11325	16
Albuquerque	77387	79669	84043	81137	78323	936	1
Baltimore Co., MD	118349	NA	NA	NA	76569	-41780	-35
Cleveland	152038	156054	132029	119520	75836	-76202	-50
Charlotte	78176	83111	77596	79731	72876	-5300	-7
Salt Lake	37325	35427	NA	NA	72442	35117	94
DeKalb Co., GA	77559	NA	NA	NA	71668	-5891	-8
Mobile	77480	75464	64373	65419	68482	-8998	-12
San Francisco	99373	94154	73733	67704	66978	-32395	-33
Ft. Worth	84005	86528	75834	71234	66925	-17080	-20
Atlanta	113841	111227	85298	82438	66649	-47192	-41
Columbus	107413	110699	97816	96993	65570	-41843	-39
Long Beach	73029	72065	60489	58518	65010	-8019	-11
Anne Arundel Co., MD	62001	NA	NA	NA	63808	1807	3
Virginia Beach City	38652	NA	NA	NA	62662	24010	62
Nashville	93063	93720	81367	77649	62230	-30833	-33

Table 1 continued

CHANGES IN TOTAL ENROLLMENT
LARGEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1967-1986

District	Year						
	1967	1968	1974	1976	1986	Change	%Change
Cobb Co., GA	38771	NA	NA	NA	62042	23271	60
El Paso ISD	59476	62105	63332	64531	61615	2139	4
Jordan, UT	20120	NA	NA	NA	61075	40955	204
Austin ISD	39644	NA	NA	NA	60899	21255	54
Denver	94995	96577	79670	74783	60290	-34705	-37
Boston	91608	94174	85826	73782	60166	-31442	-34
Polk Co., FL	51202	NA	NA	NA	59427	8225	16
Fresno USD	63669	58234	55246	54118	59112	-4557	-7
Wake Co., NC	24582	NA	NA	NA	58137	33555	137
Jefferson Parish, LA	54952	NA	NA	NA	57170	2218	4
Tucson	52091	54020	63160	59627	55544	3453	7
Newark	77891	75960	75317	71692	52740	-25151	-32
Cincinnati	87706	86807	70062	65651	52713	-34993	-40
Caddo Parish, LA	57828	NA	NA	NA	51811	-6017	-10
Portland	78664	78413	63525	59471	51639	-27025	-34
Oakland USD	68571	64102	55547	53221	51217	-17354	-25
Greenville	56051	56306	56764	55254	51183	-4868	-9
Indianapolis	108543	108587	87973	81936	50554	-57989	-53
TOTAL	7850037	6683395	6136421	5959952	6661617	-1188420	-15
AVERAGE	135345	115230	105800	102757	114855	-20490	-01.8

Note: Districts for which historical data were not included in Farley (1981) have been ommitted.

Declines in White Enrollment. One of the fiercest legal and political battles of the school desegregation struggle in the past generation has been over the claim that if desegregation plans reassigning students to other neighborhoods are implemented, there will be a drastic decline in white enrollment and the entire district will resegregate. This is part of a broader discussion of the problem of "white flight" from urban districts, which has been occurring since the 1960's. Those who advocate the view that this "loss" of white students is primarily due to negative changes in school policy contend that the trend can be reversed only if districts end desegregation plans.

The data presented in Table 2, which detail the change in the proportions of black and white enrollment during the nineteen years

between 1967 and 1986, reflect several very interesting facts. First, there have been substantial declines in the percent of white students in many suburban, as well as all urban, large districts on the list. If the small, older suburbs had been listed as well, the table would show many dramatic drops in white enrollment in districts with very few minority students. Changes that are often seen as big city problems are actually occurring in a much larger set of districts.

The data also show that the losses in the white share of the student body are by no means always accompanied by large increases in black enrollment. Those who predicted that America's urban districts would simply proceed from white to black institutions were wrong in many cases. Only about a third of the largest districts have had a gain of 10 percent or more in the proportion of black students in the nineteen year period covered by this chart. Six districts, including Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Newark, have a declining proportion of black students and many others show very modest changes. In a good many cases, the rise in the proportion of black students has not come from any increase in black enrollment, but from the fact that the enrollment of whites is falling even faster than that of blacks. Obviously there are complicated trends under way in the large districts.

Table 2

CHANGE IN PERCENT OF BLACK AND WHITE ENROLLMENT IN
60 LARGEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1967-1986

District	White						Black					
	1967	1968	1976	1980	1986	%Chg	1967	1968	1976	1980	1986	%Chg
New York	48	44	30	26	22	-26	30	31	38	38	38	8
Los Angeles	55	54	37	24	18	-37	22	23	24	23	18	-4
Chicago	41	38	25	19	14	-27	52	53	60	60	57	5
Dade Co., FL (Miami)	64	58	41	32	24	-40	24	24	28	30	33	9
Houston ISD*	54	53	34	25	17	-37	33	33	43	45	43	10
Philadelphia	40	39	32	29	25	-15	58	59	62	63	63	5
Detroit	41	39	19	12	9	-32	58	59	79	86	89	31
Dallas ISD*	63	61	38	30	21	-42	30	31	47	49	49	19
Fairfax Co., VA	97	0	NA	86	78	-19	3	0	NA	7	9	6
Broward Co., FL	74	75	75	72	65	-9	26	24	22	24	28	2
Baltimore	36	35	24	21	19	-17	64	65	75	77	79	15
Hillsborough Co., FL	80	74	76	75	69	-11	20	19	20	20	21	1
Memphis	48	46	29	24	24	-24	52	54	71	75	76	24
San Diego	76	76	66	56	44	-32	11	12	15	15	18	7
Prince Geo. Co., MD	87	NA	NA	46	32	-55	13	NA	NA	50	61	48

Table 2 continued

CHANGE IN PERCENT OF BLACK AND WHITE ENROLLMENT IN
60 LARGEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1967-1986

District	White						Black					
	1967	1968	1976	1980	1986	%Chg	1967	1968	1976	1980	1986	%Chg
Duval Co., FL	72	72	65	63	60	-12	28	28	33	36	36	8
Montgomery Co., MD	96	NA	NA	78	69	-27	4	NA	NA	12	15	11
Clark Co., NV	84	NA	NA	77	73	-11	12	NA	NA	15	15	3
Jefferson Co., FL	96	NA	NA	72	69	-27	4	NA	NA	27	30	26
Milwaukee	73	73	56	45	36	-37	24	24	37	46	53	29
Pinellas Co., FL	84	NA	NA	82	80	-4	16	NA	NA	17	18	2
Palm Beach Co., FL	71	70	64	63	62	-9	28	28	30	29	27	-1
Washington, DC	8	6	4	4	4	-4	92	93	95	94	91	-1
New Orleans	34	31	16	12	8	-26	66	67	80	84	87	21
Orange Co., FL	83	NA	NA	72	67	-16	17	NA	NA	23	25	8
Albuquerque*	61	60	52	53	55	-6	2	2	3	3	3	1
Baltimore Co., MD	97	NA	NA	86	83	-14	3	NA	NA	12	13	10
Cleveland	43	43	38	28	25	-18	56	56	58	67	69	13
Charlotte	71	71	64	60	58	-13	28	29	36	38	39	11
DeKalb Co., GA	95	NA	NA	66	49	-46	5	NA	NA	32	47	42
Mobile*	59	58	56	56	55	-4	41	42	44	43	44	3
San Francisco	42	41	28	17	15	-27	26	28	29	27	21	-5
Ft. Worth	69	67	51	44	37	-32	25	25	35	37	36	11
Atlanta	41	38	11	8	7	-34	59	62	88	91	92	33
Columbus	73	74	67	59	52	-21	26	26	32	39	45	19
Long Beach	86	85	68	53	38	-48	7	8	15	19	18	11
Anne Arundel Co., MD	86	NA	NA	84	83	-3	14	NA	NA	14	14	0
Virginia Beach City	89	NA	NA	85	80	-9	11	NA	NA	11	14	3
Nashville	76	76	69	65	63	-13	24	24	30	34	34	10
Cobb Co., GA	96	NA	NA	96	92	-4	4	NA	NA	3	6	2

Table 2 continued

CHANGE IN PERCENT OF BLACK AND WHITE ENROLLMENT IN
60 LARGEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1967-1986

District	White						Black					
	1967	1968	1976	1980	1986	%Chg	1967	1968	1976	1980	1986	%Chg
El Paso ISD	43	42	33	28	23	-20	3	3	3	4	5	2
Jordan, UT	100	NA	NA	NA	95	-5	0	NA	NA	NA	0	0
Austin ISD	81	NA	NA	53	47	-34	19	NA	NA	19	20	1
Denver	66	66	48	41	37	-29	14	14	21	23	22	8
Boston	73	68	44	35	26	-47	26	27	43	46	47	21
Polk Co., FL	77	NA	NA	77	75	-2	23	NA	NA	21	22	-1
Fresno USD	70	70	62	54	42	-28	9	9	11	12	11	2
Wake Co., NC	NA	NA	NA	NA	71	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	27	NA
Jefferson Parish, LA	NA	NA	NA	66	57	NA	NA	NA	NA	28	33	NA
Tucson	68	68	65	62	57	-11	5	5	5	5	6	1
Newark	21	18	10	9	9	-12	71	72	73	71	65	-6
Cincinnati	58	57	47	42	39	-19	41	43	53	57	60	19
Caddo Parish, LA	NA	NA	NA	45	45	NA	NA	NA	NA	55	55	NA
Portland	89	89	82	76	73	-16	8	8	13	14	15	7
Oakland USD	33	29	16	14	10	-23	52	55	67	66	62	10

*Data for 1967 extrapolated.

Note: Districts for which historical data were not included in Farley (1981) have been ommitted.

The data listed in Table 4, which ranks the largest districts by percent decline in white enrollment during the 1967-1986 period, show a very wide variety of districts among the greatest losers. The largest decline came in a Washington suburb, Prince George's County (MD), which was once the nation's largest suburban district. Prince George's was the site of a large busing plan in the early 1970's but was already experiencing substantial racial change before that time. During the 1970-1980 period it was the site of the largest suburban in-migration of blacks in the United States. One of every nine blacks added to the nation's suburban population in the 1970-80 period moved to Prince George's County. (O'Hare, 1982)

The other largest decliners included Long Beach (a satellite city of Los Angeles), DeKalb (an Atlanta suburban county that underwent a residential change somewhat like that in Prince George's County), and the cities of Dallas, Miami, Boston, Houston, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, and Atlanta. Among those cities, Dallas and Miami have implemented limited busing plans. Boston had experienced the nation's most bitter battle

over a busing plan in the mid-1970's. While both Houston and Milwaukee rely almost entirely on voluntary approaches to desegregation that emphasize magnet schools, Milwaukee's has been far more successful. Los Angeles dissolved a brief and partial mandatory busing plan in 1981 in expectation of a return of white students that never occurred. In Atlanta, black leaders decided in the early 1970's to eschew significant desegregation, partially in the hopes of avoiding white flight but the city experienced one of the highest losses of white students in the nation.

Among those systems showing very small decreases in the percent of white enrollment, three of the top six have operated metropolitan-wide city-suburban busing plans since the early 1970's. In addition, two are rapidly growing outlying counties of prosperous metropolitan areas, and the other is the nation's most heavily black school district, Washington, D.C. More than half of the twenty districts with the smallest white losses implemented the most radical form of school integration policy -- mandatory city-suburban busing -- a generation ago. There were, of course, many other factors at work, including rapid white migration into growing Sunbelt communities. At the very least, however, the data show that large-scale mandatory busing on a metropolitan level does not produce the long-term conversion of districts to virtually all-minority status. To the contrary, metropolitan busing has been occurring for a generation in many of the systems with the most stable share of white enrollment.

Table 3

28 LARGEST CHANGES IN PERCENT BLACK ENROLLMENT, 1967-1986

District	Year						
	1967	1968	1974	1976	1980	1986	%Change
Prince George's Co., MD	13	NA	NA	NA	50	61	48
DeKalb Co., GA	5	NA	NA	NA	32	47	42
Atlanta	59	62	85	88	91	92	33
Detroit	58	59	72	79	86	89	31
Milwaukee	24	24	33	37	46	53	29
Memphis	52	54	71	71	75	76	24
Boston	26	27	37	43	46	47	21
New Orleans	66	67	79	80	84	87	21
Dallas*	30	31	43	47	49	49	19
Cincinnati	41	43	51	53	57	60	19
Columbus	26	26	31	32	39	45	19
Baltimore	64	65	72	75	77	79	15
Indianapolis	32	34	43	46	50	47	15
Cleveland	56	56	57	58	67	69	13
Charlotte	28	29	34	36	38	39	11

Table 3

28 LARGEST CHANGES IN PERCENT BLACK ENROLLMENT, 1967-1986

District	Year						
	1967	1968	1974	1976	1980	1986	%Change
Montgomery Co., MD	4	NA	NA	NA	12	15	11
Ft. Worth	25	25	33	35	37	36	11
Long Beach	7	8	13	15	19	18	11
Baltimore Co., MD	3	NA	NA	NA	12	13	10
Houston*	33	33	42	43	45	43	10
Oakland USD	52	55	66	67	66	62	10
Nashville	24	24	29	30	34	34	10
Dade Co., FL	24	24	26	28	30	33	9
Jefferson Co., KY***	21	NA	NA	NA	27	30	9
New York**	30	31	37	38	38	38	8
Duval Co.	28	28	33	33	36	36	8
Denver	14	14	18	21	23	22	8
Orange Co.	17	NA	NA	NA	23	25	8

*Data for 1967 extrapolated.
**Data for 1974 extrapolated.
***Data for 1967 includes Louisville

Table 4

LARGE DISTRICTS RANKED BY PERCENT DECLINE IN WHITE ENROLLMENT, 1967-1986

District	Year						
	1967	1968	1974	1976	1980	1986	%Change
Prince George's Co., MD	87	NA	NA	NA	46	32	-55
Long Beach	86	85	74	68	53	38	-48
Boston	73	68	52	44	35	26	-47
DeKalb Co., GA	95	NA	NA	NA	66	49	-46
Dallas*	63	61	44	38	30	21	-42
Dade Co., FL	64	58	44	41	32	24	-40
Houston*	54	53	39	34	25	17	-37
Los Angeles	55	54	42	37	24	18	-37
Milwaukee	73	73	62	56	45	36	-37
Atlanta	41	38	15	11	8	7	-34

Table 4 continued

LARGE DISTRICTS RANKED BY PERCENT DECLINE IN WHITE ENROLLMENT, 1967-1986

District	Year						
	1967	1968	1974	1976	1980	1986	%Change
Austin ISD	81	NA	NA	NA	53	47	-34
San Diego	76	76	72	66	56	44	-32
Detroit	41	39	26	19	12	9	-32
Ft. Worth	69	67	55	51	44	37	-32
Denver	66	66	54	48	41	37	-29
Fresno USD	70	70	66	62	54	42	-28
Montgomery Co., MD	96	NA	NA	NA	78	69	-27
Chicago	41	38	28	25	19	14	-27
San Francisco	42	41	28	28	17	15	-27
New York**	48	44	33	30	26	22	-26
New Orleans	34	31	19	16	12	8	-26
Memphis	48	46	29	29	24	24	-24
Oakland USD	33	29	20	16	14	10	-23
Columbus	73	74	69	67.	59	52	-21
El Paso ISD	43	42	37	33	28	23	-20
San Antonio	28	27	17	15	11	8	-20
Fairfax Co., VA	97	0	NA	NA	86	78	-19
Cincinnati	58	57	49	47	42	39	-19
Cleveland	43	43	39	38	28	25	-18
Baltimore	36	35	27	24	21	19	-17
Indianapolis	68	66	57	54	49	51	-17
Portland	89	89	84	82	76	73	-16
Orange Co., FL	83	NA	NA	NA	72	67	-16
Philadelphia	40	39	33	32	29	25	-15
Baltimore Co., MD	97	NA	NA	NA	86	83	-14
Charlotte	71	71	66	64	60	58	-13
Nashville	76	76	71	69	65	63	-13
Duval Co., FL	72	72	67	65	63	60	-12
Newark	21	18	11	10	9	9	-12
Jefferson Co., KY***	80	NA	NA	NA	72	69	-11
Clark Co., NV	84	NA	NA	NA	77	73	-11
Tampa	80	74	74	76	75	69	-11
Tucson	68	68	66	65	62	57	-11
VA Beach	89	NA	NA	NA	85	80	-9
Broward Co., FL	74	75	76	75	72	65	-9

Table 4 continued

LARGE DISTRICTS RANKED BY PERCENT DECLINE IN WHITE ENROLLMENT, 1967-1986

District	Year						
	1967	1968	1974	1976	1980	1986	%Change
Palm Beach Co., FL	71	70	66	64	63	62	-9
Greenville*	79	78	76	75	NA	72	-7
Albuquerque*	61	60	55	52	53	55	-6
Jordan, UT	100	NA	NA	NA	NA	95	-5
Mobile	59	58	54	56	56	55	-4
Washington, DC	8	6	3	4	4	4	-4
Pinellas Co., FL	84	NA	NA	NA	82	80	-4
Cobb Co., GA	96	NA	NA	NA	96	92	-4
Anne Arundel Co., MD	86	NA	NA	NA	84	83	-3
Polk Co., FL	77	NA	NA	NA	77	75	-2

*Data for 1967 extrapolated.
**Data for 1974 extrapolated.
***Data for 1967 includes Jefferson County and Louisville, which was merged into the Jefferson County School System in 1975.

Note: Districts for which historical data were not included in Farley (1981) have been omitted.

All local school officials should start their thinking about the issue of white flight, or white enrollment decline, with the realization that there are millions fewer white children and many more children from minority communities in our society today than there were a generation ago. This is not primarily the result of flight but rather of birth rate, and it is affecting private as well as public education. The number of white students in all public schools in the United States fell 16 percent from 1968 to 1986 while the number of blacks grew 5% and the number of Hispanics soared 103%. Asians are increasing even more rapidly than Hispanics as the impacts of the 1965 Immigration Law and the Vietnam War are felt ever more deeply on American society. It is this change in the overall structure of minority population, together with a great preference for suburban life found even in metropolitan areas without any significant minority populations, that account for the great bulk of the changes.

Rising Hispanic and Asian Enrollments. If the share of white enrollment is declining faster than the black share is growing, it is obvious that there are other, increasingly important, groups that require much closer attention. Table 5 shows the extraordinary impact of the growing Hispanic enrollment on some of the nation's large school districts. The changes are particularly striking in the largest school

districts in the Sunbelt. During the 1968 to 1986 school years, the proportion of Hispanics nearly tripled in the huge Los Angeles and Houston districts, as well as in Chicago, the principal Midwest destination for Hispanic migration. During the same period, the proportions more than doubled in the Dade Co. (Miami), Dallas, Ft. Worth, and Newark systems.

The rate of increase was even faster in some districts that started the period with low numbers of Hispanics. Boston, for example, had a five-fold increase in proportion Hispanic. In a number of these districts, some of the increase came from the fact that Hispanic enrollment was expanding while both white and black enrollment were falling. The growth was formidable, driving a number of the most affected urban districts into the sort of severe overcrowding of neighborhood schools that central city blacks often faced in the 1950's and early 1960's.

The data on Hispanic enrollments would be even more dramatic if the changes in the suburbs of the large urban systems were included. Hispanic residence patterns are less segregated than those of blacks, and there is very rapid Hispanic student growth in a substantial number of suburban districts, particularly in Southern California and the areas adjoining big cities in Texas.

Many large districts are affected not only by the Hispanic birth rates and migration patterns, but also by the largest migration of Asians to the United States in American history. Table 5 compares the changes in the growth of Hispanic and Asian enrollment shares in the 15 largest districts in the 1986 Department of Education data. While a number of the districts report a striking increase in the numbers of these groups, the impact is very unevenly spread across the nation.

Table 5

CHANGE IN PERCENT OF HISPANIC AND ASIAN STUDENTS IN 15 LARGEST DISTRICTS, 1968-1986

	Hispanic				Asian			
District	1968	1976	1986	%Change	1968	1976	1986	%Change
New York	23	29	34	11	1	3	6	5
Los Angeles	20	32	56	36	4	6	8	4
Chicago	9	14	26	17	1	1	3	2
Dade Co., FL	17	31	42	25	0	0	1	1
Houston	13	22	37	24	0	1	3	3
Philadelphia	2	6	9	7	0	0	3	3
Hawaii	NA	2*	2	0*	NA	71*	72	1*
Detroit	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0
Dallas	8	14	28	20	0	1	2	2
Fairfax Co., VA	0	NA	4	4	0	NA	9	9

Table 5 continued

CHANGE IN PERCENT OF HISPANIC AND ASIAN STUDENTS IN 15 LARGEST DISTRICTS, 1968-1986

District	Hispanic				Asian			
	1968	1976	1986	%Change	1968	1976	1986	%Change
Broward Co., FL	1	3	6	5	0	0	1	1
Baltimore	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hillsborough Co., FL 7	4	8	1	0	0	1	1	
Memphis	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
San Diego	10	14	19	9	2	5	17	15

*The historical figures shown for Hawaii are for 1980, and the changes listed are for the period 1980-1986. Hawaii has a state-wide school system and is included in this table because of its high level of Asian enrollments.

San Diego, for example, reports more than a seven-fold increase in the number of Asians, while in New York City an inconspicuous one percent (1%) Asian enrollment in 1968 soared to a clearly visible six percent (6%) in 1986. The huge Washington suburban district of Fairfax County (VA), which serves one of the nation's most affluent suburban communities, reports a nine percent (9%) Asian enrollment. Since Asian students perform better than white students, on average, this increase in minority enrollment obviously has very different consequences than the increase in the concentration of highly disadvantaged black, Hispanic, or American Indian students. (Urban school administrators, however, often point out that the central cities tend to receive brand-new Asian immigrants, who need special language programs or who may come from disadvantaged subgroups, such as the hill tribes of Indochina.) Table 6, which shows the largest increases in percent Asian enrollment, indicates that the Asian immigration to large districts is highly focused on just a handful of systems. Asians now comprise the largest plurality of all students in San Francisco, where the school district recognizes a number of distinct Asian and Pacific sub-communities in both its statistics and its desegregation plan.

Table 6

DISTRICTS WITH LARGEST PERCENT GAIN IN ASIAN ENROLLMENT, 1968-1986

District	Year			%Change
	1968	1976	1986	
San Francisco	18	29	45	27
Long Beach	2	5	18	16
San Diego	2	5	17	15
Fresno USD	2	2	14	12
Oakland US	5	7	16	11

Table 6 continued

DISTRICTS WITH LARGEST PERCENT GAIN IN ASIAN ENROLLMENT, 1968-1986

District	Year 1968	1976	1986	%Change
Fairfax Co., VA	0	NA	9	9
Portland	1	3	8	7
Boston	2	3	8	6
New York	1	3	6	5
Los Angeles	4	6	8	4
Philadelphia	0	0	3	3
Denver	1	1	4	3
New Orleans	0	1	3	3
Houston	0	1	3	3

Overall Enrollment. Losses and Gains. Among the 15 large school districts experiencing the greatest overall declines in enrollment during the 1968-1986 period, all but Baltimore County and Nashville were central city districts and none was a major destination for Hispanic migration. (See Table 7). Atlanta was the only Sunbelt district to make the list of most rapid declines.

Table 7

15 LARGEST DECLINES IN ENROLLMENT BY PERCENT CHANGE, 1967-1986

District	Year 1967	1986	Change	%Change
Indianapolis	108543	50554	-57989	-53
Cleveland	152038	75836	-76202	-50
Detroit	293000	159669	-133331	-46
Washington, DC	148911	84630	-64281	-43
Atlanta	113841	66649	-47192	-41
Cincinnati	87706	52713	-34993	-40
Columbus	107413	65570	-41843	-39
Baltimore	191997	118081	-73916	-38
Denver	94995	60290	-34705	-37
Baltimore Co., MD	118349	76569	-41780	-35

Table 7 continued

15 LARGEST DECLINES IN ENROLLMENT
BY PERCENT CHANGE, 1967-1986

District	Year			
	1967	1986	Change	%Change
Boston	91608	60166	-31442	-34
Portland	78664	51639	-27025	-34
Philadelphia	279907	187139	-92768	-33
San Francisco	99373	66978	-32395	-33
Nashville	93063	62230	-30833	-33
TOTAL	2059408	1238713	-820695	-40
AVERAGE	137294	82581	-54713	-40

Among the districts experiencing the largest gains in overall enrollment, almost three-fourths were metropolitan or suburban districts. With the exception of Salt Lake City, all of the large city districts on the list were located in the Sunbelt and had rapidly growing Hispanic enrollments.

Table 8

LARGEST INCREASES IN NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED

District	Year			
	1967	1986	Change	%Change
Broward Co., FL	93777	131726	37949	40
Salt Lake	37325	72442	35117	94
Wake Co., NC	24582	58137	33555	137
Clark Co., NV	62967	95023	32056	51
Palm Beach Co., FL	59080	84680	25600	43
Virginia Beach City	38652	62662	24010	62
Fairfax Co., VA	107990	131945	23955	22
Dade Co., FL (Miami)	220011	243690	23679	11
Cobb Co., GA	38771	62042	23271	60
Austin ISD	39644	60899	21255	54
Hillsborough Co., FL	94641	115373	20732	22
Pinellas Co., FL	74706	88934	14228	19
Orange Co., FL	72800	84125	11325	16
Polk Co., FL	51202	59427	8225	16
Tucson	52091	55544	3453	7
TOTAL	1068239	1406649	338410	32
AVERAGE	71215	93777	22561	44

Enrollment Trends Summary. Those who studied the changing composition of American urban school districts in the late 1960's were quite right in predicting the continuing decline of white and middle class students in the large central city systems and the continuing increase in minority students and racial isolation. The Civil Rights Commission's 1967 report to President Lyndon Johnson, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, for example, summarized much of the available data. There have, however, been major unexpected developments. The minority enrollment is far more diverse and much more heavily Hispanic than then expected. Asians have become a significant and very rapidly growing part of our school population. Suburbs, then described as white areas, are now becoming multi-racial in some areas.

Policy has changed a great deal since the 1960's and we now know a great deal more about the long-term consequences of various approaches to desegregation. There were no large scale busing orders then and we now have a generation of experience with extremely different approaches in different cities.

Looking back a generation later, it is obvious that much of the 1960's discussion about black school districts and much of the 1970's discussion about white flight from school desegregation represented oversimplifications of the emerging realities. Huge regional economic and population changes, a continuing white "birth dearth", massive immigration, and the continuing movement of both whites and minorities into parts of suburbia have transformed the social composition of major American school districts. The next section will explore the consequences of those changes for the segregation of each major group of students during this 19-year period.

SEGREGATION AND DESEGREGATION TRENDS

The basic reason that the federal government began to collect racial data on American public schools in the late 1960's was that the data were needed to carry out the government's responsibility to implement the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which required nondiscrimination in all institutions receiving federal aid. This law gave federal education officials responsibilities for working with the courts to enforce the constitutional requirements of the Supreme Court's 1954 decision in Brown v. Board of Education and subsequent decisions requiring racial desegregation of public schools with a history of illegal segregation. During the 1964-1972 period of active enforcement in the southern and border states there was a major decline in the segregation of those region's black students. The South went from almost total segregation in 1963, when fewer than two percent (2%) of black students were in schools with white students, to become the most integrated region of the country by 1970, a distinction it has since maintained.

After the Nixon Administration suspended active enforcement of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Supreme Court raised major barriers to city-suburban desegregation in its 1974 decision on the metropolitan

Detroit case, Milliken v. Bradley, there has been no major change in the level of black segregation. The Supreme Court has made no decisions expanding urban school desegregation law since its 1973 decision in the Denver case, authorizing city-wide busing plans outside the South, and the law remains much what it was 15 years ago. There are, however, radically different desegregation policies in various parts of the country due to a variety of legal histories, different records of litigation, and the fact that single districts in some areas contain entire metropolitan regions, while other metropolitan areas are divided into hundreds of school districts. Widely different policies followed over a long period mean that we can now compare the long-term effects of different approaches to school desegregation. Over the entire period studied, Table 9 shows that blacks become more integrated and Hispanics more segregated.

Table 9

PERCENT OF U.S. BLACK AND HISPANIC STUDENTS IN PREDOMINANTLY MINORITY AND 90-100 PERCENT MINORITY SCHOOLS, 1968-1984

	predominantly minority		90-100% minority	
	blacks	Hispanics	blacks	Hispanics
1968-69	76.6	54.8	64.3	23.1
1984-85	63.5	70.6	33.2	31.0

This study provides data on four different measures of segregation, two of which can be followed from the late 1960's to show change in the experiences of minority and white students. For the 1986-87 school year, data detailing the percentages of black and Hispanic students who attended either 50-100 percent white or 90-100 percent minority schools are provided for the large districts. The two measures followed over time are the exposure index, which shows the changing racial composition of a school attended by a typical black or Hispanic student over time within a school district, and the Taeuber (dissimilarity) index, which shows the extent to which minority and white students are equally distributed among all schools within a district. Each of these measures shows some important facts about the nature and extent of segregation.

Black Segregation in 1986-1987. The experience of black students varies from virtually total segregation to a complete absence of predominantly minority schools among the nation's largest school districts. While some cities have become more integrated, others have become more segregated. Desegregation orders and voluntary plans affecting cities with large nonwhite enrollments may have the most impact on lowering the proportion of blacks in virtually all-black schools and in diminishing the isolation of blacks from the small number of remaining whites. If one thinks of integration as entry into a school that

reflects the mainstream of the society, however, or if one believes that the principal educational value of desegregation comes from opening up opportunities for middle class education to low income children, integration with a few whites in a minority school cannot be considered substantial. Nonetheless, it does represent a significant change in practices within the school district. Many of the central cities with white majorities do have desegregation plans: either voluntary, mandatory, or combined. All have succeeded in producing high levels of integration in predominantly white schools.

Table 10 shows the current status of the nation's largest urban districts according to three measures of segregation of black students.

Table 10

SEGREGATION LEVELS FOR BLACK STUDENTS IN LARGE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1986-87

District	% in majority white schools	% in 90-100% nonwhite schools	% whites in sch. of typical black students
Albuquerque	51.8	2.5	47.2
Akron	48.5	27.1	42.4
Anchorage	90.0	0	70.0
Atlanta	1.6	90.8	4.3
Austin	21.8	6.9	35.6
Baltimore	5.1	68.3	10.3
Birmingham	5.0	74.9	9.3
Boston	4.0	13.3	22.3
Brownsville	0	84.8	7.5
Chicago	2.4	81.3	6.0
Cincinnati	15.8	21.2	28.6
Cleveland	.9	5.2	23.4
Columbus	51.3	0	50.2
Colo. Sprgs.	88.6	0	72.3
Corpus Christi	6.9	51.2	20.8
Dade (Miami)	8.2	59.2	15.1
Dallas	4.6	65.7	11.8
Dayton	12.6	0	36.0
Denver	19.0	0	35.8
Des Moines	95.5	0	74.0
Detroit	.6	76.1	6.6
D.C.(Washington)	.5	94.1	1.9
El Paso	9.8	3.1	31.9
Flint	11.8	48.7	19.6
Ft. Wayne	67.2	13.9	56.9
Ft. Worth	22.1	36.4	25.0
Fresno	23.7	25.7	29.7
Gary	0	97.3	2.2
Houston	3.4	69.6	10.4
Indianapolis	44.6	0	48.9
Jackson	9.9	73.2	12.4

Table 10 continued

SEGREGATION LEVELS FOR BLACK STUDENTS IN LARGE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1986-87

District	% in majority white schools	% in 90-100% nonwhite schools	% whites in sch. of typical black students
Jersey City	.3	79.1	6.1
Kansas City(Mo.)	9.6	53.3	17.8
Los Angeles	4.9	70.0	11.7
Memphis	12.0	66.0	14.8
Milwaukee	11.8	23.6	31.6
Minneapolis	57.2	.3	54.1
Montgomery	29.4	37.8	30.8
New Orleans	.7	84.2	5.2
New York City	6.8	74.1	10.4
Newark	1.0	96.6	1.8
Norfolk	13.4	16.8	32.0
Oakland	1.5	83.7	6.3
Oklahoma City	27.9	18.9	35.5
Omaha	72.0	0	59.5
Philadelphia	10.6	73.7	12.2
Portland	47.7	0	52.6
Richmond	.1	56.6	9.9
Rochester	9.5	23.3	26.3
Sacramento	12.1	0	33.5
St. Louis	6.8	64.5	14.9
San Antonio	0	81.3	6.7
San Diego	26.5	8.5	35.9
San Francisco	0	49.3	13.4
San Jose	67.6	0	51.5
Seattle	25.8	4.5	43.1
Toledo	34.2	39.0	34.5
Tucson	63.0	1.4	55.6
Tulsa	37.0	29.2	39.8
Wichita	91.2	0	67.6

Only one-sixth of these districts had as many as half their black students in majority white schools, and those were all districts with a majority of white students and a relatively small proportion of blacks. Almost half of the largest districts had a tenth or less of their black students in predominantly white schools, and the students in these large districts were far more segregated, on average, than students in the South have been since the early 1970's. At the extreme, about a fifth of these large urban districts had three-fourths or more of their black students in intensely segregated schools with 90-100% minority students. These systems included some of the nation's largest and most important, including Atlanta, Detroit, Chicago, and Washington. In the majority of these districts, the typical black student attended a school where 30 percent or fewer of his or her classmates were white.

Black students attending school in some of the nation's largest suburban districts also showed a wide variety of experiences during the 1986-87 school year. Table 11 shows that in some of these districts, there were either effective desegregation plans or such small black enrollments that the vast majority of black students attended majority white schools. In other suburban districts, however, there are large numbers of black students in intensely segregated schools. This is particularly true in Baltimore County, Md., which has never had a significant desegregation plan, and in Prince George's County, Md. and DeKalb County, Ga., which are experiencing large-scale residential transitions. Overall, there has been very little policy attention to segregation of suburban schools by either civil rights groups or government agencies.

Table 11

SEGREGATION LEVELS FOR BLACK STUDENTS IN SELECTED LARGE SUBURBAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1986-87

District	% in majority white schools	% in 90-100% nonwhite schools	% whites in sch. of typical black students
Anne Arundel Co., MD	82.2	0	69.8
Baltimore Co., MD	5.1	68.3	10.3
Cobb Co., GA	100.0	0	85.8
DeKalb Co., GA	28.6	48.7	25.8
Fairfax Co., VA	93.5	0	70.8
Jefferson Par., LA	64.9	0	52.4
Gwinnett Co., GA	*		
Henrico Co., VA	59.9	8.4	52.4
Mesa, AZ	*		
Montgomery Co., MD	76.3	3.1	60.2
Prince George's Co., MD	9.4	23.2	25.5
Pulaski, AR	82.3	0	63.3
Virginia Beach	96.6	0	75.5

* Indicates districts with less than five percent black enrollment.

The most far reaching effort to provide substantial desegregation for black students came in a number of major school districts that implemented extensive city-suburban busing across huge county school systems that included virtually the entire city and suburban rings of some of the nation's very large metropolitan areas. The first such plan came in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, N.C., as a direct result of the Supreme Court's decision in the 1971 Swann case. Within months there were similar orders affecting almost all of the large metropolitan areas of Florida, and a number of other similar county level school districts in different regions. The courts subsequently mandated the merger of city

and suburban school districts in two other metropolitan areas: Louisville and Wilmington. Table 12 shows the level of integration for black students enrolled in those districts in the 1986-87 school year.

Table 12

SEGREGATION LEVELS FOR BLACK STUDENTS IN METROPOLITAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH METROPOLITAN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION PLANS, 1986-87

District	% in majority white schools	% in 90-100% nonwhite schools	% whites in sch. of typical black students
Mobile, AL	34.0	43.1	30.1
Broward Co., FL	41.6	23.9	40.0
Brevard Co., FL	88.3	0	72.7
Duval Co., FL	50.9	14.9	44.4
Hillsborough Co., FL	80.8	1.5	61.9
Escambia Co., FL	63.6	9.5	50.3
Orange Co., FL	53.2	7.4	46.2
Palm Beach Co., FL	36.4	27.9	37.0
Jefferson Co., KY	93.3	0	66.8
Charlotte, NC	65.2	3.2	54.4
Clark Co., NV	79.3	3.5	64.9
Greenville, SC	87.4	1.8	65.1
Nashville (Davidson Co.), TN	62.0	2.1	56.2

More than three-fourths of the metropolitan districts listed had most of their black students in majority white schools a decade and a half after their original plan. More than two-thirds had a tenth or less of their black students in intensely segregated schools with 90-100 percent minority students. In several districts the typical black student was enrolled in a school with 60 percent or more white students, even though there were substantial black enrollments in the central cities and the plans provided mandatory two-way city-suburban busing. There can be little doubt that many metropolitan plans have provided high and relatively durable levels of desegregation for a generation.

The most segregated large districts for black students according to three measures of segregation are indicated in Table 13. The five cities that appear in the nation's five worst on two or more of the measures of segregation for black students are Atlanta, Gary, Newark, New Orleans, and Washington, D.C.

Table 13

CITIES WITH HIGHEST LEVELS OF SEGREGATION OF
BLACK STUDENTS ACCORDING TO THREE MEASURES, 1986-87
(Large districts with more than 10% blacks)

% of blacks in majority white schools	% of blacks in 90-100% nonwhite schools	% whites in school of typical black students
Gary (0)	Gary (97.3)	Newark (1.8)
San Antonio (0)	Newark (96.6)	D.C. (wash.) (1.9)
San Francisco (0)	D.C. (Wash.) (94.1)	Gary (2.2)
Richmond (.1)	Atlanta (90.8)	Atlanta (4.3)
Jersey City (.3)	New Orleans (84.2)	New Orleans (5.2)
D.C. (Wash.) (.5)	Oakland (83.7)	Chicago (6.0)
Detroit (.6)	Chicago (81.3)	Jersey City (6.1)
New Orleans (.7)	San Antonio (81.3)	Oakland (6.3)
Cleveland (.9)	Jersey City (79.1)	Detroit (6.6)
Newark (1.0)	Detroit (76.1)	San Antonio (6.7)

Changes over time in the segregation of black students. Trying to understand the experience of an entire generation of students since the beginning of efforts to desegregate large school districts in the late 1960's requires that we examine not only the current level of segregation, but those of the past two decades as well. Table 14 shows the change in exposure of blacks to white students in the schools of the largest districts between 1968 and 1986.

The largest gain in desegregation among the urban school districts came in Omaha, Nebraska, which implemented a large-scale mandatory order after winning a temporary postponement from the Supreme Court. All of the districts, in fact, which gained 20 points or more in desegregation levels had major mandatory desegregation orders.

The data shows very few cases of substantial improvement by 1986 in cities where blacks were intensely segregated 19 years earlier. Of the 16 school districts in which black students were attending schools with average enrollments of less than a tenth white students in 1968 only two had their black students in schools averaging more than 15% white students by 1986. Several had become even more intensely segregated during this period. Only Cleveland and Ft. Worth became significantly more desegregated, and that was only to an average level of one-fourth white students.

Table 14 also shows that a number of districts which made significant improvements in levels of desegregation between 1968 and 1974 later lost ground over the period through 1986. This may reflect either general demographic change in the district which diminished the possibility for integration, or a change in the desegregation plan, or both. By far the

largest increase in racial isolation during this period came in Oklahoma City, which was permitted by a federal court to dismantle part of its desegregation plan before fall 1986. The other major district that dismantled part of a comprehensive desegregation plan was Norfolk, Virginia, where the typical black student also became more isolated. Other systems with declines in integration levels of more than five percent (5%) since the mid-1970's include Denver, El Paso, Ft. Worth, Memphis, Minneapolis, Portland, Richmond, and Sacramento.

Table 14

CHANGES IN EXPOSURE OF BLACKS TO
WHITES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1968-1986
(Percent whites in school of typical black student)

District	1968	1974	1986	Change 1968-86
Albuquerque	34.1	43.3	47.2	13.1
Akron	37.6	35.0	42.4	4.8
Atlanta	5.7	8.7	4.3	-1.4
Baltimore	10.0	10.5	10.3	.3
Birmingham	6.0	12.1	9.3	3.3
Boston	27.4	32.8	22.3	-5.1
Chicago	5.4	3.2	6.0	.6
Cincinnati	25.5	21.3	28.6	3.1
Cleveland	6.5	5.4	23.4	16.9
Columbus	29.5	31.8	50.2	20.7
Dade Co. (Miami)	11.7	24.5	15.1	3.4
Dallas	5.6	14.4	11.8	6.2
Dayton	11.6	19.4	36.0	24.4
Denver	20.3	43.7	35.8	15.5
Detroit	13.4	10.7	6.6	-6.8
D.C.(Washington)	2.6	1.5	1.9	-.7
El Paso	48.0	52.2	31.9	-16.1
Flint	30.9	23.3	19.6	-11.3
Ft. Worth	9.1	39.0	25.0	15.9
Fresno	16.0	29.3	29.7	13.7
Gary	5.7	5.8	2.2	-3.5
Houston	5.7	11.3	10.4	4.7
Indianapolis	21.6	38.1	48.9	27.3
Jersey City	23.5	13.6	6.1	-17.4
Kansas City(Mo.)	14.8	8.8	17.8	3.0
Los Angeles	7.5	10.2	11.7	4.2
Memphis	3.5	20.9	14.8	11.3
Milwaukee	17.9	18.6	31.6	13.7
Minneapolis	63.7	69.7	54.1	-9.6
New Orleans	8.9	8.9	5.2	-3.7
New York City	23.2	16.5	10.4	-12.8
Newark	6.8	3.4	1.8	-5.0

Table 14 continued

CHANGES IN EXPOSURE OF BLACKS TO
WHITES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1968-1986
(Percent whites in school of typical black student)

District	1968	1974	1986	Change 1968-86
Norfolk	11.5	45.2	32.0	20.5
Oakland	13.6	10.2	6.3	-7.3
Oklahoma City	12.2	62.5	35.5	23.3
Omaha	26.6	37.4	59.5	32.9
Philadelphia	13.9	9.1	12.2	-1.7
Portland	54.8	62.3	52.6	-2.2
Richmond	7.6	21.4	9.9	2.3
Rochester	42.2	32.0	26.3	-15.9
Sacramento	56.6	50.8	33.5	-23.1
St. Louis	6.6	4.7	14.9	8.3
San Antonio	9.2	14.5	6.7	-2.5
San Diego	26.3	37.8	35.9	9.6
San Francisco	25.6	26.8	13.4	-12.2
San Jose	42.8	55.6	51.5	8.7
Seattle	47.8	45.3	43.1	-4.7
Toledo	24.7	26.8	34.5	9.8
Tulsa	16.2	38.9	39.8	23.6
Wichita	36.3	75.4	67.6	31.3

Note: Districts for which historical data were not included in Farley (1981) have been omitted.

Sources: All data for years before 1986 comes from Reynolds Farley, Final Report to National Institute of Education, NIE Grant #G-79-0151, October 1981. 1986 data from OCR computer tapes. Districts lacking data for earlier years are omitted.

The other measure available for understanding the change in the racial segregation of large school districts is the Taeuber Index, in which a value of 100 means total separation of the two populations studied among schools in a district and a value of zero indicates random distribution of each group among all schools to produce racial balance within a district. While this is a frequently used measure of desegregation, its meaning can be difficult to interpret, particularly in districts with highly skewed distributions of students. For example, in an 86 percent black district a perfect integration score (0) would mean that all the schools were 86 percent black. The opposite would be true in an 86 percent white district. This measure is most meaningful when applied to districts with substantial representation of each group studied or to metropolitan school attendance areas.

Table 15

LARGEST U.S. SCHOOL DISTRICTS
CHANGE WITHIN DISTRICT SEGREGATION OF BLACKS FROM
WHITES, MEASURED BY TAEUBER INDEX, 1967-1986
(0 = racial balance with district, 100 = complete segregation)

District	1967	1974	1986
New York	62.2	69.5	73.3
Los Angeles	91.3	83.4	69.8
Chicago	89.5	92.0	78.3
Dade Co. (Miami)	86.7	63.6	63.6
Houston	92.5	79.3	66.1
Philadelphia	74.8	81.3	73.0
Detroit	74.7	74.9	63.1
Dallas	93.1	77.6	64.9
Broward Co., FL	86.7	33.6	54.5
Baltimore	82.3	75.8	66.0
Hillsborough Co. (Tampa)	83.7	20.9	28.4
Memphis	95.0	51.1	66.1
San Diego	79.7	61.0	42.1
Duval Co., FL	91.8	36.7	42.9
Milwaukee	85.9	78.5	28.4
Pinellas Co. (St.Pete)	83.8	26.2	45.5
Palm Beach Co.,FL	82.2	34.5	56.8
Washington,D.C.	75.1	84.2	90.6

Note: Districts for which historical data were not included in Farley (1981) have been omitted.

Sources: All data for years before 1986 comes from Reynolds Farley, Final Report to National Institute of Education, NIE Grant #G-79-0151, October 1981. 1986 data from OCR computer tapes. Districts lacking data for earlier years are omitted.

The data does suggest, however, some important conclusions about changes in desegregation plans over the 19-year period. The data show that the increased segregation of black students in some central city districts is not caused by an increase in the separation between the remaining whites and the blacks in the district. In most cases the distribution of students among schools has become more random and less segregated. The problem is, therefore, the result of an overall racial change in the school district's population. Two exceptions to this, however, are New York and Washington, D.C., where the level of racial balance between whites and blacks remaining in each district has declined.

All of the large Florida districts on this list show a different pattern -- a major decline in their level of black-white separation on the Taeuber Index between 1967 and 1974, followed by a substantial

increase (except in Dade Co.) in the index by 1986. This may well reflect the failure of those districts to update their desegregation plans to take into account the tremendous population growth many of them have experienced. Population growth will, over time, produce greatly expanded ghettos and whole new rings of white suburbia. The level of integration created by even the most comprehensive plan will then erode unless the plan is accordingly adjusted.

Hispanic Segregation. In contrast to two decades of heated discussion over segregation problems and desegregation remedies for urban blacks, there has been very little research or discussion concerning the desegregation of Hispanic students. From 1968 to 1986, however, segregation of Hispanic students has increased very substantially. The effects of this trend are particularly evident in the data in Table 16, which shows the level of segregation in the largest districts with more than 4% Hispanic students during this period.

Table 16

SEGREGATION LEVELS FOR HISPANIC STUDENTS IN LARGE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1986-87
(Large Districts with more than 4% Hispanics)

District	% in majority white schools	% in 90-100% nonwhite schools	% whites in sch. of typical Hisp. students
Albuquerque	32.9	4.0	39.2
Austin	33.8	5.4	41.5
Brownsville	0	94.3	4.0
Buffalo	19.0	0	35.7
Chicago	5.8	50.2	16.6
Colorado Sprgs.	91.2	0	74.9
Corpus Christi	4.9	44.0	20.7
Dade Co. (Miami)	8.3	41.7	19.4
Dallas	7.4	39.2	18.7
Denver	10.1	0	32.0
El Paso	6.6	41.8	17.7
Ft. Worth	19.9	23.2	26.7
Fresno	24.0	6.7	32.6
Houston	3.9	53.2	13.9
Jersey City	5.7	47.7	17.0
Los Angeles	3.2	68.8	11.3
Milwaukee	12.8	15.5	29.8
New York	6.7	67.8	12.2
Newark	10.2	74.3	11.6
Oakland	1.0	88.0	5.6
Okla. City	45.5	.1	49.8
Philadelphia	14.7	53.5	19.7
Rochester	8.6	24.9	25.1

Table 16 continued

SEGREGATION LEVELS FOR HISPANIC STUDENTS IN
LARGE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1986-87
(Large Districts with more than 4% Hispanics)

District	% in majority white schools	% in 90-100% nonwhite schools	% whites in sch. of typical Hisp. students
Sacramento	14.6	0	35.3
San Antonio	0	75.4	6.9
San Diego	33.5	5.6	38.2
San Francisco	0	53.1	12.3
San Jose	45.0	0	42.3
Seattle	43.8	1.7	47.9
Toledo	80.3	1.8	65.9
Tucson	29.4	17.5	37.3

Less than a tenth of Hispanic students are in majority white schools in a number of the districts that serve the largest Hispanic populations, including Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and Miami. With the exception of Colorado Springs, Oklahoma City, Toledo, Seattle, and San Jose (which has a recent court order in the first major urban desegregation case brought by Hispanic plaintiffs), there are few districts with high levels of access to majority white schools.

While Hispanic students do not yet confront the extreme level of segregation that blacks face in the virtually all-minority schools of some central city systems, there are clear signs that similar levels of isolation are developing in some large central cities. In Los Angeles, the most important U.S. district for Hispanics, 69% of the students are in 90-100 percent minority schools and the white enrollment in the school of the typical Hispanic student is only 11 percent. Chicago has 50% of its Hispanic students in intensely segregated minority schools; Houston, 53%; San Antonio I.S.D., 75%; and New York City, 68%. Although it is true that a smaller fraction of Hispanic than black students attend central city schools, very large numbers of Hispanic inner city residents are attending extremely segregated schools whose academic performance level is very similar to segregated black schools in the same cities.

Hispanic students may, however, fare better than black students when they reach the suburbs. Table 17 examines the statistics from several large suburban districts with at least 5% Hispanic enrollment. A detailed study of the suburbs of metropolitan Houston now under way at the University of Chicago shows a pattern of much greater integration for suburban than central city Hispanic students. Table 17 shows extremely high proportions of Hispanic students in majority white schools in most of these districts. The data from Santa Ana in the heart of California's affluent Orange County, however, shows that when large residential

concentrations of Hispanics develop in suburban regions, as has happened in a number of sections of Southern California, the students there may face high levels of segregation.

Table 17

SEGREGATION LEVELS FOR HISPANIC STUDENTS IN SELECTED LARGE SUBURBAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1986-87

District	% in majority white schools	% in 90-100% nonwhite schools	% whites in sch. of typical Hisp. students
Aldine, TX	18.0	0	38.4
Arlington, TX	100.0	0	72.9
Jefferson Co., CO	100.0	0	88.3
Jefferson Par., LA	70.6	0	56.7
Mesa, AZ	100.0	0	81.0
Montgomery Co., MD	74.5	5.8	58.2
Orange Co., CA	79.3	0	61.8
Richardson, TX	76.5	0	68.0
Riverside, CA	89.7	0	59.0
Santa Ana, CA	1.3	78.8	9.0
Scottsdale, AZ	100.0	0	89.7

Since most of the areas that have implemented metropolitan school desegregation plans have few Hispanic students, it is more difficult to understand the effects of such plans on Hispanic segregation. The data from Table 18, however, show that in five areas with court-ordered metropolitan plans and at least 5% Hispanic students, there are extremely high levels of integration and very few students attending intensely segregated schools. Since these cases were not brought with the goal of desegregating Hispanic students, this result is the product of a system that simply eliminates all-minority schools through massive desegregation efforts, and integrates Hispanics as a by-product.

Table 18

SEGREGATION LEVELS FOR HISPANIC STUDENTS IN METROPOLITAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH METROPOLITAN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION PLANS, 1986-87
(districts with more than 5% Hispanic students)

District	% in majority white schools	% in 90-100% nonwhite schools	% whites in sch. of typical Hisp. students
Broward Co., FL	79.1	2.4	64.8
Hillsborough Co., FL	82.3	1.2	62.4
Orange Co., FL	87.9	.3	69.0
Palm Beach Co., FL	61.4	11.1	56.5
Clark Co., NV	80.4	.2	66.2

Among the nation's large school districts, those that are most segregated for Hispanic students include the very largest school districts in the U.S., some Texas districts with overwhelming majorities of Hispanics district-wide, and some cities with extremely few white students, where almost all students are in overwhelmingly non-white schools. Those that make the list of ten worst on all three measures of segregation include Los Angeles, San Antonio, Chicago, New York City, Houston, Brownsville, Newark, and Oakland.

Table 19

CITIES WITH HIGHEST LEVELS OF SEGREGATION OF HISPANIC STUDENTS ACCORDING TO THREE MEASURES, 1986-87
(Large districts with more than 4% Hispanics)

% of Hispanics in majority white schools	% of Hispanics in 90-100% nonwhite schools	% whites in school of typical Hispanic students
Brownsville (0)	Brownsville (94.3)	Brownsville (4.0)
San Antonio (0)	Oakland (88.0)	Oakland (5.6)
San Francisco (0)	San Antonio (75.4)	San Antonio (6.9)
Oakland (1.0)	Newark (74.3)	Los Angeles (11.3)
Los Angeles (3.2)	Los Angeles (68.8)	Newark (11.6)
Houston (3.9)	New York (67.8)	New York (12.2)
Corpus Christi (4.9)	Philadelphia (53.5)	San Francisco (12.3)
Jersey City (5.7)	Houston (53.2)	Houston (13.9)
Chicago (5.8)	San Francisco (53.1)	Chicago (16.6)
El Paso (6.6)	Chicago (50.2)	Jersey City (17.0)

Looking at the changes in levels of segregation over time in large urban districts with significant Hispanic enrollments, the picture of increasing segregation is dismally consistent, much more so than for black students. In the majority of the districts analyzed in Table 20 there has been an increase of more than 20% in the percent of minority students in the school of the typical Hispanic student in the 18 year period under study. The only exception to this negative trend is a slight gain in integration in San Jose, which occurred under the spur of a Hispanic-initiated desegregation suit. Most of the other school districts with lower increases in segregation were those districts that already had such high levels in 1968 that they could not go up much higher. An important exception is Albuquerque, which has maintained a constant level of integration throughout the period under study. The general trend toward increasing isolation over time, however, is unambiguous.

Table 20

CHANGES IN EXPOSURE OF HISPANICS TO
WHITES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1968-1986
(Large districts with more than 4% Hispanics)

% Whites in school of typical Hispanic students

District	1968	1974	1986	Change 1968-86
Albuquerque	40.0	38.0	39.2	-0.8
Chicago	41.7	30.6	16.6	-25.1
Dade Co. (Miami)	45.3	32.0	19.4	-25.9
Dallas	48.0	40.7	18.7	-29.3
Denver	46.1	44.3	32.0	-14.1
El Paso	19.8	21.7	17.7	-2.1
Ft. Worth	55.9	38.5	26.7	-29.2
Fresno	54.5	51.0	32.6	-21.9
Houston	38.1	28.6	13.9	-24.2
Jersey City	25.3	23.8	17.0	-8.3
Los Angeles	31.8	25.0	11.3	-20.5
New York	18.7	15.9	12.2	-6.5
Newark	21.8	16.9	11.6	-10.2
Oakland	30.0	17.7	5.6	-24.4
Sacramento	58.2	52.2	35.3	-22.9
San Antonio	16.2	12.9	6.9	-9.3
San Diego	57.8	54.0	38.2	-19.6
San Francisco	40.7	26.6	12.3	-28.4
San Jose	40.0	40.9	42.3	2.3

Note: Districts for which historical data were not included in Farley (1981) have been omitted.

Sources: All data for years before 1986 comes from Reynolds Farley, Final Report to National Institute of Education, NIE Grant #G-79-0151, October 1981. 1986 data from OCR computer tapes. Districts lacking data for earlier years are omitted.

Summary of Hispanic Segregation Trends. Hispanics have experienced constantly increasing segregation in the nation as a whole and in the large districts where they are concentrated since the 1960's. As their numbers have mushroomed and the white enrollment has plummetted in many of these districts, increasing isolation in minority schools becomes inevitable. The trend toward increasing segregation might have been offset if there had been a significant effort to achieve desegregation for Hispanics, as is illustrated in the San Jose statistics. Unless these long-established and powerfully consistent trends are reversed, Hispanics will face intense segregation, particularly the lower income Hispanics who reside in central cities. If there is any sign of encouragement in these discouraging trends it comes from the limited

evidence from large suburban and metropolitan districts where Hispanics experience high levels of desegregrated education.

ISSUES FOR POLICY DISCUSSION

Nearly two decades of data on racial change and segregation in the largest U.S. school districts show that the basic trend is toward declining white enrollment in central city and many suburban school districts. As a result the number of districts in which significant and lasting integration will be possible for the nation's segregated urban minority children will continue to shrink. Substantial and lasting integration in many areas will require desegregation across school district boundary lines. When the Supreme Court blocked city-suburban integration, as it did in the Detroit and Atlanta cases, the result was a denial of any remedy for the black students living in what are still some of the nation's most intensely segregated metropolitan areas. When the Court approved metropolitan desegregation, as it did in the case of Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg, or permitted a lower court to order it, as in the metropolitan Louisville case, these data show broad scale and lasting integration.

The clear trends in large district enrollments mean that the ultimate resolution of the city-suburban issue will decide whether there will be integration for millions of segregated minority students in a society with a constantly shrinking white majority.

Although the data presented here clearly shows that sweeping mandatory metropolitan plans can work well, such cases are very difficult to win under current law and less sweeping approaches involving a great deal less coercion deserve attention. Perhaps the time has come for a serious national discussion of voluntary approaches to city-suburban desegregation of the sort initiated during the last year by the state educational leaders in Minnesota and Connecticut. In Minnesota state officials have responded to the approach of a majority non-white school district in the largest city, Minneapolis, with proposed incentives for voluntary transfers between city and suburban schools. In Connecticut the intense segregation by race and income of the central cities in several small and affluent metropolitan areas poses a serious problem but one that could be addressed by expansion of the suburban exchange program in metropolitan Hartford which has had highly positive results since its initiation in the mid-1960's. The fact that some state education leaders have taken leadership on this very sensitive issue for the first time in many years, is an encouraging development, although neither plan was enacted in 1988.

This report shows the extent to which the largest central city districts remain vitally important to blacks and Hispanics, educating nearly three in ten students. At the same time, they have become almost irrelevant to the nation's white population, 97% of whom go to school elsewhere. Under such circumstances, whites have little contact with or

direct knowledge of the needs of these districts, which resemble nothing so much as the "separate societies" predicted by the Kerner Commission in its famous report on the future of American cities in 1968. In areas of rapid black and Hispanic suburbanization, even middle class minority leaders may lose touch. Students in schools in those cities are increasing isolated from the educational mainstream and increasingly likely to finish school without real preparation to enter either college or the job market. It is very important to renew the debate over ways to give them access to the schools that do function much better to prepare young people for success, most of which are white suburban schools.

Many of the state reforms of the 1980's simply ignore the fact of segregation and inequality among the schools. We have been engaged in a process in recent years of attacking the victims of the process of educational and economic segregation and assuming that simply enacting more rigid testing and curriculum requirements in state capitals will solve the problems of inequality. It is even more important now for educational leaders, journalists, and researchers to try to explain the special needs of those urban districts and the importance of opening up contact between central city children and opportunities in what has become a suburban society.

The statistics in this report not only show the continuing urgency of policies to open up access for segregated minority children but they also indicate that big city and some suburban districts must also begin to work out another critical pattern of race relations. Much of the future of central city education, if city-suburban separation is rigidly maintained is going to involve a different kind of race relations -- the working out of delicate and unfamiliar relationships between black and Hispanic students, professionals, and officials. In some cases substantial Asian and American Indian enrollment must also be accommodated. Data not reported here show high levels of segregation between blacks and Hispanics in urban school systems and this is often segregation between overcrowded Hispanic schools and underutilized nearby black schools. In some cities, particularly on the West Coast, the issues will be rendered all the more complicated by the presence of a large and internally complex, Asian community. Very little discussion and almost no serious research have been devoted so far to analysis of these vital issues. These questions will not solve themselves without serious attention any more than did black-white relations.

Urban school districts are showing us what kind of a society we are becoming, although they are experiencing demographic changes much sooner and in a more sweeping way than the rest of the society. The data presented here suggest both that the problems of the racial transition under way in our population are not self curing and will affect a larger and larger portion of our workforce and future electorate. The problems of working out access and equity for minority children who seek success in American life through education but face segregation from the educational mainstream, have not seriously been addressed by state and national policy makers since the 1960's. They should again become a central part of our national debate over educational policy and the urban future.

About the Council

The Council of Urban Boards of Education is a component of NSBA's Direct Affiliate Program. Individual school boards are eligible to participate in CUBE if they are a member of their state school boards association and they serve a community with a core city population of at least 100,000. The Council is governed by a Steering Committee composed of urban school board members from across the United States. This Steering Committee works to improve board members' effectiveness as policy makers in urban schools.

About NSBA

The National School Boards Association is a not-for-profit organization whose primary mission is the advancement of education through the unique North American tradition of local citizen control. In this way, education policy is decided by local school board members who are directly accountable to the community. NSBA promotes the quality of education through services to state school boards associations and local school districts. It represents school boards' interests in Washington, D.C. before Congress, federal education agencies, and other national regulatory bodies.

Federation Members of NSBA include the 49 state school boards associations and the boards of education of Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Founded in 1940, NSBA represents approximately 97,000 of the nation's school board members who, in turn, govern the schools attended by 97% of all U.S. public school children.

National School Boards Association
1680 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 838-6722